

The FCC should make every effort to protect low power FM (LPFM) and the community-oriented content it provides. Unlike the consolidated commercial radio landscape, LPFM stations provide quality local programming and enhance the diversity of local voices available to their communities.

Full power stations should not be allowed to cut into the coverage area of LPFM stations and knock them off the air. The FCC should adopt a policy that denies a full power station's modification application if granting the application would reduce the coverage area available to LPFM stations.

LPFM stations also should be afforded higher priority than translators. Translators only repeat programming, sometimes from hundreds of miles away. Every new translator takes the place of a potential LPFM station that would provide original local programming. The FCC should give locally controlled and operated LPFM station applications precedence over translator applications.

The FCC should consider the circumstances under which low power stations operate when determining the rules for their licensing. For LPFM service to be more accessible to community groups, the FCC should modify its rules so that typical changes on a non-profit board would be permissible under FCC rules. Similarly, the FCC should allow low power stations a greater amount of time to construct stations and to shift ownership.

The FCC has the responsibility to protect the service of low power radio and nurture its growth. Congress is considering legislation to expand the service by removing the restrictions on the third-adjacent channel, which could allow LPFM to expand into larger communities. The FCC should take every opportunity to tell Congress that the technological landscape is ready for this change.

This is a matter that is near and dear to my heart in a "BIG" way. As it usually goes with politics or bureaucracy, most people are too busy to be consumed with it (myself included). However, nothing has brought my attention to politics as much as the initial 1996 relaxation of the FCC rules, pertaining to radio specifically. Most of us become involved when we realize that we have been affected directly, or even sometimes indirectly by measures that have been taken by bureaucrats in our name, or in this case, without our knowledge. Hence, the lack of specific coverage and how it

pertains to us.

For example, I feel that I speak on behalf of all struggling musicians (one sector of the radio audience). Why? Well, first of all, if there's a lack of diversity in radio, there is little or no chance for hardworking musicians to get heard in an already difficult field. Consider how this also has an effect on the listening audience, who in turn ends up being robbed of the full scope of what is deemed "the American experience" and "beyond.". Where are the Aretha's, the "Stones, the "Beatles", the "Springsteens", the "Dylans" of today (There are some exceptions, of course, that have managed to break into the mainstream as of late, but NOT nearly enough according to the standards that we should as a country be holding ourselves up to)? You can bet that that kind of talent wasn't just specific to a certain era. They are right here today, and they deserve to be heard.

Another example would be consolidation's effect on business. It's effect on the music business has been huge. I argue that it's been just as disastrous as the whole illegal downloading epidemic of the last decade, up until now, and maybe beyond (depending on you, the FCC). How is big business supposed to invest in "new" talent if they know that they're not going to get their marketing investments back due to the fact that there are only one or two playlists that account for each genre across the whole country? That pretty much spells the death of any regional build up for "most" acts on majors and pretty much "certain death" if you're an independent.

I could go on.. How about how its effects on local business? How are they supposed to compete in an advertising market coming from a local, start-up level if they're put in the same boat as those that are already "well" established on a national level. You get the picture...It's bad for business and bad for the little guy/woman in general.

Last, but not of least importance, what about the effect on local news? I'm fortunate enough to live in a big metropolis such as Los Angeles, so finding alternative information, though it's been increasingly difficult, is generally much easier for us inner-city folk. Still, I can't stress enough about the significance of its decline! More importantly, what about all of our American brothers and sisters who don't reside in these areas (which I might add, have become increasingly more expensive..another issue)? We could do a lot to improve the quality of their lives by putting at least some of the airwaves

back into their hands!

Like I said, opening up the airwaves for LPFMs across our nation can only be
GOOD FOR BUSINESS!

Thanks for your time.